



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/687,886

10/13/2000

Kail Lester Linebrink

13DV13462

8821

29399

7590

10/17/2003

JOHN S. BEULICK

C/O ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP

ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE

SUITE 2600

ST. LOUIS, MO 63102-2740

EXAMINER

KOCZO JR, MICHAEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3746

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2003

27

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/687,886

Applicant(s)

LINEBRINK, KAIL LESTER

Examiner

Michael Koczo, Jr.

Art Unit

3746

-- **Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-9,11-16 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-9,11-16 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's arguments filed on July 28, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the structure of claim 1 (fuel system interface receiving electrically and mechanically originated over-speed signals) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Applicant argues that the structure of claim 1 is shown in figures 2 and 4. However, figures 2 and 4 show separate embodiments. No single figure shows the structure as recited in claim 1.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

✓ The amendment filed on July 28, 2003 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: the amendments to page 2, paragraph 2, and page 6, paragraph 2.

Art Unit: 3746

Applicant argues that the claims as filed in the original specification are part of the disclosure and applicant may amend the specification to include the claimed subject matter. This would apply if there were no conflict between the claimed subject matter and the subject matter described in the specification. However, in the instant application as originally filed, the claimed subject matter (version I: electrically and mechanically originated over-speed signals) conflicts with that which is described in the specification (version II: electrically or mechanically-originated over-speed signals). In order to determine which of these versions applicant intended to be the invention, one must establish which version has the most descriptive support. The only support for version I is in the claims. The drawings support only version II since they show the electrically or mechanically originated over-speed signals as separate embodiments in separate figures. The specification also supports only version II. See page 2, line 4 (“electrically-originated or [emphasis added] mechanically-originated over-speed sensing system”), page 2, line 20, (“fuel flow can only be initiated when the [emphasis added] overspeed signal is removed”), and page 7, lines 19 and 20 (“The interface accomodates overspeed signals that originated from electronic or [emphasis added] mechanical speed sensors.”). This evidence indicates that applicant intended version II as his invention. Therefore, applicant cannot now attempt to rewrite the specification to conform with the claims without introducing new matter.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1 to 3, 5 to 9, 11 to 16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 1 recites a fuel system interface receiving electrically and mechanically originated over-speed signals. There is no detailed description, or any mention whatsoever, in the specification, as originally filed, of a fuel system interface which receives electrically and mechanically originated over-speed signals. The original specification describes a fuel system interface which receives only electrically originated over-speed signals (figure 2), a fuel system interface which receives only mechanically originated over-speed signals (figure 4) and a fuel system interface which receives only hydraulically originated over-speed signals (figure 5).

One of ordinary skill in the art would therefore not know what is the purpose of having electrically and mechanically originated over-speed signals, and how the electrical and mechanical speed sensors would operate in conjunction with each other and how they would interface with the fuel control system.

The claims now recite that the fuel system interface receives a plurality of overspeed signals and that “fuel flow is only initiated when each over-speed signal is removed”. This is new matter because there is no basis for this in the specification as originally filed. For example, see page 6, line 15, which states that “fuel flow can only be initiated when the over-speed signal is removed”. That is, there is only one overspeed signal, not a plurality as claimed.

Art Unit: 3746

Applicant's arguments are merely unsubstantiated allegations. For example, applicant argues that "one of ordinary skill in the art, after reading the specification in view of the Figures, would determine that the subject matter in the specification is described in such a manner as to reasonably convey that the Applicant had possession of the claimed invention, at the time the application was filed." However, no evidence, such as affidavits, has been submitted to support these allegations.

Conclusion

The prior art could not be applied to the claims due to their basis on a non-enabling disclosure.

This is a continuation application. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed previously and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered previously. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however,

Art Unit: 3746

event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service Office whose telephone number is 703-306-5648.

Any inquiry relating to patent applications in general should be directed to the Patent Assistance Center at 1-800-786-9199.



Michael Koczko, Jr.
Primary Examiner
Group Art Unit 3746

M. Koczko, Jr./mnk
October 16, 2003
TEL 703-308-2630
M-F 7:30 to 16:00
FAX 703-872-9302
After Final FAX 703-872-9303